

Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 59, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—59

Abraham	Faircloth	Lugar
Ashcroft	Frist	Mack
Bennett	Gorton	McConnell
Biden	Graham	Moseley-Braun
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Bradley	Grassley	Pell
Breaux	Gregg	Pressler
Brown	Hatch	Robb
Burns	Hatfield	Roth
Campbell	Helms	Santorum
Chafee	Hutchison	Shelby
Coats	Inhofe	Simpson
Cochran	Jeffords	Snowe
Cohen	Johnston	Specter
Coverdell	Kassebaum	Stevens
Craig	Kempthorne	Thomas
D'Amato	Kerry	Thompson
DeWine	Kyl	Thurmond
Dole	Lautenberg	Warner
Domenici	Leahy	

NAYS—34

Akaka	Feingold	Lieberman
Baucus	Feinstein	Mikulski
Bingaman	Ford	Moynihan
Boxer	Glenn	Murray
Bryan	Harkin	Pryor
Bumpers	Heflin	Rockefeller
Byrd	Hollings	Sarbanes
Conrad	Inouye	Simon
Daschle	Kennedy	Wellstone
Dodd	Kerrey	Wyden
Dorgan	Kohl	
Exon	Levin	

NOT VOTING—7

Gramm	Murkowski	Smith
Lott	Nunn	
McCain	Reid	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 59, and the nays are 34. Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn, not having voted in the affirmative, the motion to invoke cloture is rejected.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the vote was 59 to 34. That would be short. Right?

Mr. FORD. That is the way I calculate it.

Mr. DOLE. We will have to decide. I will let the Democratic leader know whether we will have another cloture vote on Thursday. But I think it is pretty obvious that had our absentees been here, we would have had cloture, and we have pretty good bipartisan support. It seems to me that we are pretty close to a bipartisan resolution of this matter.

I will let my colleagues know as soon as we can because I know some have plans and some would like to have plans.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHINA AND TAIWAN

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, China is making bellicose statements about Taiwan. This morning's Washington Post begins an editorial with these words:

If it came to that, the United States would have no choice but to help Taiwan—a flourishing free-market democracy—defend itself against attack by Communist China. No treaty or law compels this response, but decency and strategic interest demand it. An American Government that allowed the issue of Taiwan's future be settled by China's force would be in disgrace as well as in error.

Mr. President, the best way to avoid force or to avoid giving a dictator and a dictatorship the appetite that will not be satisfied with conquering one area is to make clear that that will be resisted by the community of nations. I am not talking about the use of American troops, but I think American air power clearly ought to be brought to bear if such an eventuality should take place.

If China is permitted to grab Taiwan, I think it will be only a matter of time before China takes Mongolia and other areas. I think the best way of maintaining stability in that area of the world is to be firm.

I heard my colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, refer to our policy toward China as one of zigzagging. I think that is a correct analysis of what we are doing. I think we ought to be firm; we ought to be positive. I want to have good relations with China, but China should not think for a moment that she can invade Taiwan without having serious problems. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Post editorial and also an A.M. Rosenthal op-ed piece in the New York Times, "Washington Confronts China."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 6, 1996]

IF CHINA ATTACKS TAIWAN

If it came to that, the United States would have no choice but to help Taiwan—a flourishing free-market democracy—defend itself against attack by Communist China. No treaty or law compels this response, but decency and strategic interest demand it. An American government that allowed the issue of Taiwan's future to be settled by China's force would be in disgraced as well as in error.

This is what the United States should be conveying, and China pondering, as Beijing steps up military pressure on Taiwan. Down that road lies a possible direct confrontation with Washington. Even starting out on that road carries heavy risks for China. Especially dangerous is any possibility that Beijing may be setting out under the dubious and smug impression that the United States will back off and leave China with no heavy costs to pay at all.

But, of course, to be faced with an actual decision on rescuing a threatened Taiwan

would itself signify a calamitous American policy failure. There is overwhelming national need and also adequate time to keep today's friction from becoming tomorrow's explosion.

The ever more glaring contrast between Beijing's totalitarianism and Taipei's American-nursed democracy, and the end of the Cold War, have weakened the 20-year-old international formulas supporting China's peaceful reunification with its wayward province. A significant opposition in Taiwan now favors independence. The government, coming up on Taiwan's first democratic presidential election, has had to bend, in part by seeking official American visas for its leaders, thus provoking Beijing. The Clinton administration has been slow to grant the visas, not wishing to aggravate its other tensions with China. American legislators of different stripes have come to Taiwan's side, further provoking Beijing.

Broad, forward-looking "dialogue" with China has been out of style in Washington since George Bush imprudently sent secret emissaries to Beijing after the Tiananmen massacre. Fighting fires has been in. This is a fire. The United States needs to encourage calming gestures by Taiwan (suspend the visa provocations) and China (suspend the thuggish threats). At home, it needs to reach a policy consensus with Congress in order to better show China that it cannot squeeze Taipei and to convey to Taiwan that it should not set about deliberately and recklessly on a policy of trying to draw the United States into an escalating showdown with Beijing. Then the two sides can return to the irregular but peaceful relationship they were pursuing before.

[From the New York Times]

WASHINGTON CONFRONTS CHINA

(By A.M. Rosenthal)

Washington has chosen the issue on which it will at last acknowledge and confront Chinese Communist action detrimental to the United States.

There was a considerable list to choose from. China threatens daily missile attacks against Taiwan. Beijing sells missiles to Iran and other Mideast dictatorships. At home it increases arrests and jail sentences for dissidents. It allows Internet use to only a relative handful, and from now on only through government-controlled ports.

Each act involves the U.S. An attack on Taiwan would force U.S. involvement. Sales of missiles endanger Mideast peace and defy U.S. policy against proliferation of high-tech weapons.

Increasing repression and closing access to international information is a slap at the U.S. Washington had assured the world of the opposite—that freedoms would increase in China after the 1994 Clinton Administration decision not to use economic pressure to ease oppression.

Well, enough is enough. Washington now says it will show its staunch determination to resist Chinese provocation—about compact disks. If China does not stop counterfeiting these disks, the Administration will increase tariffs on Chinese goods by as much as \$1 billion.

Any commercial piracy costs manufacturers and artists money and should be opposed. But to appreciate the CD episode fully it helps to have a taste for bitter comedy.

1. The Communists will not keep any new promise better than they keep existing ones—or others, like ending slave-labor exports to the U.S.

2. If they do camouflage piracy better, they will demand concessions—like even tighter zipping of the U.S. mouth on human rights.

3. The U.S. announcement accentuates the moral disaster of Clintonian policy on China.

CD's yes, people no. Mr. Clinton broke his promise to use tariff pressure to persuade Beijing to treat its Chinese and Tibetan political victims less viciously—maybe a mite less torture. Beijing answers by increasing, not decreasing, political oppression. He acts surprised.

Democrats and Republican politicians talk about the danger of cynicism. But they expect Americans not to see the cynicism of putting CD's above the blood of dissidents in China's gulags.

Worse, they may be right. I do not hear American university students or professors mobilizing against Chinese Communist cruelties, or consumers organizing a boycott like the one that helped kill South African apartheid.

If war comes to Taiwan, it will not be because Beijing believes its lie that Taiwan is preparing to declare its deserved independence. It will be because 100 miles off China's shore, Chinese people have created a society that is both prosperous and democratic. That so terrifies the perpetually insecure Politburo that it risks war—not only against Taiwanese independence of government but Taiwanese independence of mind.

Beijing uses missile threats to intimidate Taiwanese into voting for a party that is running on a pro-China platform and against independent-minded opponents.

The Taiwan Relations Act, passed by Congress in 1979, says that U.S. recognition of Communist China rests on the expectation that Taiwan's future will be determined by peaceful means.

The law states that any effort to determine Taiwan's future by other than peaceful means—which includes threats of daily missile attacks—are of grave concern to the U.S. and should be "promptly" reported by the President to Congress.

The President has not done that, promptly or at all. Nor has Congress demanded it, despite some members' attempts. Mr. Gingrich and Mr. Dole, the agenda-setters, become accomplices in the President's decision to ignore U.S. law.

Restraint is needed, we are told by U.S. officials and some journalists—we do not want a war over Taiwan, do we? Of course not. That is what facing the possibility is all about.

As long as Congress and President ignore their legal obligation to deal with China's threat to Taiwan, decide what steps to take and let China know, Beijing will believe it can attack Taiwan or keep terrorizing it, with no risk.

That is not restraint of confrontation that could lead to war. It is the blundering encouragement of both. How terribly many times must we learn?

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I see the majority leader is on the floor, and I yield the floor to him.

AGRICULTURAL MARKET TRANSITION ACT OF 1996

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator from Illinois. I want Members to know I have had a brief visit with the distinguished Democratic leader, Senator DASCHLE. We have now asked staff on each side to see if they can sit down and work out a series of amendments on each side on the farm bill and work into the evening and work tomorrow and set a time certain for action on

something, say 6 o'clock. That means we would have, if there is an agreement—we do not have it yet, we just started—so if there is an agreement, then there would be votes tonight, there would be votes tomorrow.

It is my hope that part of that agreement, if in fact one is reached, would be a recess period until the 26th of February, because many, including many of the staff in the Senate, have been here right around the clock through the Christmas holidays and New Year's.

In any event, that is all we can advise our colleagues at this time. If we have any additional information, we will pass it on. So I cannot put out the no-vote signs. There could be votes tonight. We will let you know as soon as we can.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota, [Mr. Grams] is recognized.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise at this time to discuss an amendment that had been filed by Senator KENNEDY to S. 1521, the farm bill. Like the Senator from Massachusetts, and also the chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee, Senator KASSEBAUM, I do support health care reform—specifically, improvements such as health insurance portability and putting an end to discrimination against those with preexisting conditions.

As both a Member of the House and the Senate, I have worked for such reforms, and I look forward to supporting such legislation in the near future. But as they say, timing is everything. There are undoubtedly many people watching the Senate asking themselves what the Senator from Massachusetts is up to. I must confess to being one of them.

The purpose of the farm bill was to give our Nation's farmers and the people they work with a clear roadmap of Federal farm policy with which to make the decisions this year about planting, equipment purchases, and loans. Given that that question remains, why would the Senator have been offering an amendment dealing with health insurance to the farm bill? In all honesty, I still do not know. It does not make sense. Unfortunately, a lot of what goes on sometimes does not make a lot of sense.

For example, last Thursday night, a hotline call from the majority leader's office was made to find out if there were any objections to bringing up for consideration the Kassebaum-Kennedy health insurance legislation—the very subject matter of the Senator's amendment filed by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Upon receiving this call, I requested more time to review the legislation.

As a Senator from Minnesota, I have always taken my responsibility to study the legislation considered by the Senate seriously—to examine its implications, to detect any possible unforeseen consequences, and to evaluate it

on the basis of the needs and concerns of the people I represent—the taxpayers of Minnesota.

This is the way we Minnesotans make our decisions—carefully and thoughtfully. We do not have a reputation for simply rubberstamping the bills that affect us and the rest of the Nation. When we put our seal of approval on something, it is done with the utmost care and thought.

Perhaps this is a bigger deal in Minnesota than it is in Washington. But it should not be.

As a result, I simply asked that the request for a time agreement wait until I had had a chance to conduct my review. But as usual, things have been blown out of proportion, and as a result, we may be faced with the Kennedy amendment—a proposal that should make as little sense in Washington as it does in Minnesota.

Having studied the Kassebaum-Kennedy legislation, I have come to the conclusion that it would be counterproductive to take this matter up right now at a time when the Federal Government has much unfinished business left on its plate.

As a taxpayer, I can not understand why the Senate would move to the issue of health insurance reform, without some assurances to the American people that we and the President will complete the business before us—balancing the budget, saving Medicare from bankruptcy, providing tax relief to taxpaying families so they can afford insurance, and reforming the welfare system.

Before we go on to other issues and other agendas, shouldn't all of us—Republicans and Democrats—make every effort possible to carry out the taxpayer's agenda?

This question is even more critical, given that the President's own health care financing administration projects that the Medicare Program, for the first time in 23 years, faces a deficit and will go bankrupt sooner than anyone had previously predicted.

Does it make any sense to rush ahead on health insurance reform at a time when the Medicare Program faces insolvency? I think not.

Back in November, Congress gave President Clinton an opportunity to address this problem—by passing a Medicare reform proposal which would have saved the trust fund from bankruptcy, while expanding health care options available to senior citizens.

Now, they say that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure—and had the President followed this sound advice and signed the bill, we would not be in this mess in the first place.

Well, he did not sign the bill, we are in this mess, and now some Members of the Senate want to move ahead on their agenda without addressing the Medicare crisis. These some Members want to move ahead on their agenda without addressing the primary concerns of the taxpayers, such as the balanced budget, tax relief, and welfare reform.